

Remarks

Applicant has reviewed the Office Action dated as mailed April 11, 2008 and the documents cited therewith. After the above amendments have been made, the present application contains claims 1-15. Claim 11 has been amended and new claim 34 has been added. Claims 16-33 have been cancelled.

Claim Rejections under 35 U.S.C. §103

Claims 1 – 15 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Amro, et al. (U.S. Patent 6,950,861) in view of Bates, et al. (U.S. Patent 5,877,766). This rejection is respectfully traversed. Turning initially to Claim 1, Claim 1 recites:

“loading a URL personal databook collection object in response to receiving the results of a network search by a search engine, wherein the URL personal databook collection object comprises URL references that have been previously visited by a user and selectably saved in the URL personal databook collection object by the user; and a comment, associated with each URL reference, entered and saved by the user to indicate a reason why each URL reference was stored in the URL personal databook collection object...”

Column 3, lines 15 – 19 of Amro were cited in rejecting this feature of Claim 1. Column 3, lines 15 – 22 of Amro recite:

“Search engine 112 may also receive a search term and an identifier that identifies computer system 110 from computer system 130. In this case, search engine 112 causes bookmarks 102 on computer system 100 to be accessed and receives identifiers associated with bookmarks 102. Search engine 112 searches the database and websites associated with bookmarks 102 and provides the results of the searches to computer system 130.”

In contrast to Amro, Claim 1, as recited above, requires loading a URL personal databook collection object in response to receiving the results of a network search by a search engine. Accordingly, claim 1 requires that the URL personal databook collection object is loaded after receiving the results of the network search (*emphasis added*). Amro, in contradistinction, teaches that the bookmarks 102 are used by the search engine 112 to perform the database and website searches. Thus, the bookmarks 102 of Amro must be accessed before the search is conducted

and Amro does not teach or suggest loading a URL personal databook collection object in response to receiving the results of a network search as provided by the embodiment of the present invention recited in Claim 1.

Bates was cited in the Office Action for teaching a user being able to enter a comment about a document which includes the description of the document (Column 25, lines 38 – 40 of Bates). Applicant respectfully submits that Bates also does not teach or suggest loading a URL personal databook collection object after receiving the results of a search and Bates adds nothing to the teachings of Amro so as to render Claim 1 unpatentable.

For all of these reasons discussed above, Applicant respectfully submits that Claim 1 is patentably distinguishable over Amro and Bates. Reconsideration and withdrawal of the §103 rejection of Claim 1 is respectfully requested.

With respect to the rejection Claims 2 – 10 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Amro in view of Bates, these claims recite additional features which further patentably distinguish over Amro and Bates. Additionally, Claims 2 - 10 depend either directly or indirectly from independent Claim 1. Because of this dependency, Claims 2 - 10 include all of the features of Claim 1. Therefore, Claims 2 – 10 are also submitted to be patentably distinguishable over Amro and Bates, and reconsideration and withdrawal of the §103 rejection of these claims is respectfully solicited.

Turning now to the rejection to independent Claim 11 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Amro in view of Bates, Claim 11 has been amended to recite:

“comparing the results from a network search by the search engine to any URL object references of previously visited URLs in a URL personal databook collection object loaded after receiving the results of the network search...”

As previously discussed, Amro teaches that the bookmarks 102 are used in conducting the search and neither Amro nor Bates teach or suggest that the URL personal databook collection object is loaded after receiving the results of the network search as recited in amended Claim 11. Accordingly, independent Claim 11 is respectfully submitted to be patentably distinct over Amro and Bates, and reconsideration and withdrawal of the §103 rejection of Claim 11 is respectfully requested.

With respect to the rejection of Claims 12 – 15 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Amro in view of Bates, these claims depend either directly or indirectly from independent Claim 11. Because of this dependency, Claims 12 – 15 include all of the features of independent Claim 11. Therefore, these claims are submitted to be patentable over the cited documents for the same reasons as discussed with respect to Claim 11, and reconsideration and withdrawal of the §103 rejection of Claims 12 – 15 is respectfully requested.

New Claim 34 recites:

“receiving results from a search of websites on a network corresponding to at least one search term, wherein only the at least one search term is entered by a user and only the at least one search term is used by a search engine to perform the search;

loading a URL personal databook collection object only after receiving the results of the network search by the search engine, wherein the URL personal databook collection object comprises URL references that have been previously visited by a user and selectably saved in the URL personal databook collection object by the user; and a comment associated with each URL reference, entered and saved by the user to indicate a reason why each URL reference was stored in the URL personal databook collection object...”

As previously discussed, Amro teaches entering a search term and using bookmarks to search a database and websites. Accordingly, Amro does not teach using only at least one search term to perform the search. Additionally, as previously discussed, neither Amro nor Bates teach or suggest loading a URL personal databook collection object only after receiving the results of the network search by the search engine as required by new Claim 34. For all of these reasons, Claim 34 is submitted to be patentable over the documents of record, and allowance of new Claim 34 is respectfully solicited.

Conclusion

Entry of this Amendment under 37 C.F.R. §1.116 is respectfully requested in that this Amendment cancels claims to reduce the number of issues for appeal.

If the Examiner has any questions about the present Amendment, please contact the undersigned at the telephone number indicated.

If necessary, please charge any additional fees or credit overpayment to Deposit Account No. 09-0461.

Respectfully submitted,

Fonda J. Daniels
(Applicant)

Date: July 11, 2008

By: Charles L. Moore
Charles L. Moore
Registration No. 33,742
Moore & Van Allen PLLC
P.O. Box 13706
Research Triangle Park, N.C. 27709
Telephone: (919) 286-8000
Facsimile: (919) 286-8199